

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections of record in the February 16, 2005 *Office Action*.

Status of the Application

Claims 7-10 are all the claims pending in the Application, as claims 1-6 are hereby cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-10 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner has rejected: (1) claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hoang* (US 5,446,958); hereinafter “*Hoang*”); (2) claims 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hoang* in view of *Kataja* (US 2002/0057029; hereinafter “*Kataja*”); (3) claims 7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hoang* in view of *Honma* (US 6,175,295; hereinafter “*Honma*”); and (4) claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hoang* in view of *Honma* and *Kataja*. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As an initial matter, the rejections of claims 1-6 are now moot, as claims 1-6 are cancelled herein.

Regarding independent claim 7, the Examiner alleges that *Hoang* discloses many of the features recited therein, but concedes that it fails to teach or suggest claim 7’s recitation that “the winding axis [is] perpendicular to the upper surface of the printed circuit board.” Applicant agrees that *Hoang* is deficient in this regard.

Nevertheless, the Examiner cites bobbin 3 of *Honma* as showing such features, and alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention (“one of skill”) would have

been motivated to modify *Hoang* in view of *Honma* “for the purpose of facilitating mounting [of a] reducing projected area” (*O.A.*, p. 5).

Applicant respectfully disagrees: (1) with the Examiner’s reading of *Honma*; and (2) the Examiner’s allegation that one of skill would have modified *Hoang* to provide the vertical arrangement alleged by the Examiner.

First, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in *Honma* of just how the bobbin 3 is mounted with respect to a printed circuit board. While the Examiner seems to be assuming that bobbin 3 is arranged perpendicularly to a printed circuit board due to the arrangement of terminals 9, such an assumption cannot provide the required teaching or suggestion.

Second, *Hoang* is specifically directed to providing the configuration of FIG. 9 therein to **reduce** the height of the bobbin (col. 3, lines 17-22). However, the Examiner’s alleged combination would necessarily result in a **thicker** bobbin / board combination than that shown in FIG. 9 of *Hoang*, which is directly contrary to the stated purpose of that embodiment. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that one of skill would not have been motivated to modify *Hoang* as the Examiner alleges.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 7 is patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that rejected dependent claims 8-10 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-10 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 7-10.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 30, 2005